i			
1 2	Philip L. Pillsbury, Jr. (SBN 72261) Vedica Puri (SBN 176252) Eric K. Larson (SBN 142791)		
3	PILLSBURY & LEVINSON, LLP		
4	The Transamerica Pyramid 600 Montgomery Street, 31 st Floor		
5	San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 433-8000		
6	Facsimile: (415) 433-4816 E-mail: ppillsbury@pillsburylevinson.com		
7	vpuri@pillsburylevinson.com rlarson@pillsburylevinson.com		
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterdefendant COPART INC.		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
12	OAKLAND DIVISION		
13	COPART INC.,	Case No. C 07 2684 CW-EDL	
14	Plaintiff,	E-FILING	
15	vs.		
16	CRUM & FORSTER INDEMNITY	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF COPART, INC.'S	
17	COMPANY, UNITED STATES FIRE	MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT	
18	INSURANCE COMPANY, and DOES 1-10, Inclusive,		
19	Defendants.	Date: August 21, 2008 Time: 2:00 p.m.	
20		Place: Courtroom 2, 14 th Floor Before the Hon. Claudia Wilken	
21	AND RELATED CROSS-ACTION	Action Filed: March 20, 2007	
22		Trial Date: November 10, 2008	
23	After a review of Plaintiff Copart, Inc.'s Motion For Summary Judgment, and the		
24	papers and evidence submitted in support of and in opposition to this motion, and after		
25	considering all the arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing, the Court has determined		
26	that for all the reasons set forth in Copart's motion, Copart's motion for summary judgment		
27	should be granted in its entirety as follows: (1) on the liability of USFIC under the First Claim		
28	of Copart's Complaint for Breach of Contract on the ground that the plain meaning of the		
	-1- [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MT FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT Case No. C 07 2684 CW-EDL		
	[[I KOI OSED] OKDEK GKANTING I EANTTIN' SWITTOK SOMMAKT JODOMENT Case No. C 07 2004 CW-EDE		

Document 69

Filed 07/10/2008

Page 1 of 2

Case 4:07-cv-02684-CW

PILLSBURY & LEVINSON, LLP The Transamerica Pyramid 600 Montgomery Street, 31st Floor · San Francisco, CA 94111

applicable October 1, 2005 – October 1, 2006 property insurance policy provides coverage for
Copart's location known as "Yard 105" as a matter of law; (2) on the First Claim of USFIC's
Counterclaim for reformation on the grounds that (a) USFIC's request for reformation asks the
Court to write an entirely new policy and is improper as a matter of law, and (b) USFIC has
not and cannot come forward with clear and convincing evidence of mistake; and (3) on the
Second Claim of USFIC's Counterclaim for negligent misrepresentation on the grounds that
(a) there were no representations of fact made by Copart only opinions as a matter of law;
and (b) the speculative "benefit of the bargain" theory of damages that USFIC advances is
improper as a matter of law.
SO ORDERED.
Dated:

JUDGE CLAUDIA WILKEN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE